

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for discussing the application on August 31, 2006. In that discussion, possible claim amendments were considered, however, no indication of allowance was given nor sought.

Background

The present invention simplifies the access of medical data by making each application in a workspace “context sensitive” to the patient whose records are being accessed by other applications in that workspace. Thus, for example, if Jane Doe’s billing records are being reviewed in the workspace (by a billing application), when the user opens a clinical documentation application, the clinical documentation application initially also opens Jane Doe’s clinical documentation records. Multiple workspaces may be created associated with different patients so that sets of open applications can be quickly initialized to particular patients.

Amendment to the Claims

The claims have been amended to incorporate three new limitations.

First, the independent claims have been amended to clearly indicate that each of the software applications has an independent interface that may be used to access arbitrary patient records. That is, the applications are truly independent applications that can be used to look at records of any patient.

Second, the scope of the context sensitivity is only applications that are being run by a single user.

Third, the claims have been amended to change the phrase “software component” to “software applications” and to change the phrase “context data” to “current patient”. These changes are believed to make the claims easier to understand.

Claimed Objections

Claims 98 and 109, lines 3, have been amendment to change “proving” to –providing—as noted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 97-117 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sun.

As noted by the Examiner, Sun discloses an electronic healthcare system having a graphical user interface and a computer communicating with the interface. Further, as noted by

the Examiner, the Sun system teaches that the interfaces are context sensitive as to the roles of the particular users.

The present claims, as now amended, can be distinguished from Sun by the fact that the present invention is context sensitive to the identity of the patient whose records are being viewed by the application, not the role of the user of the application. This is clearly indicated, for example, in claims 97 and 108, which now state that new software applications are initialized "to also access records related to the current patient" where the current patient is a "patient whose records are being accessed by currently open applications." Thus, the present claims, as amended, distinguish from the Sun application.

At column 3, paragraphs [0022]-[0025] of Sun, cited by the Examiner, a situation is described where multiple users are viewing the same data of the patient. It is not apparent that the applications used by these different users are, in fact, context aware of the patient being viewed by other users. However, the current claims have also been amended to indicate that the context sensitivity of the present invention is established for an individual user, not among different users of the same application on different machines.

The Applicant believes that the Sun application's teaching of context awareness of the user of the application does not fairly teach or suggest providing application programs that automatically initialize themselves based on the data being viewed by other application programs open by the user. For this reason, the current claims should also allowable under §103 in light of the Sun reference.

The claims have also been amended, based on discussions with the Examiner, to require each of the software applications be able to independently access records of different patients (that is have an independent interface). It is believed that this amendment distinguishes the present application from "bundled programs" that all share a common interface, for example, a word processor that includes a spell checker program that automatically checks the open document, but that cannot be used to open and check a different document.

Support for the current amendments is found in a number of locations in the originally filed specification. The limitation that the applications have independent interfaces to access records of different patients finds support at paragraphs [0025] and [0026], which note that when context cannot be established for a given application, e.g., using the present invention, a dialog

window is opened as an interface to allow the user to initialize the application, for example, to an arbitrary patient record.

The limitation that the context is established only from applications opened by a single user is supported, for example, at paragraph [0023], which indicates that a user may have multiple workspaces, each having multiple open applications ("activities") and paragraph [0025] indicating that context data is extracted from the currently open activities in a workspace (implicitly for a user).

Throughout the present application at particularly at paragraph [0014] the phrases "activities" and "applications" are used interchangeably, according to the common understanding that an application is a software program that provides for a particular set of functions. For this reason "software component" had been changed to "software application".

The fact that the "context data" is the identification of a particular patient is also found, for example, in paragraph [0025], which indicates that the workspace context may, for example, be a patient identification from an open activity in the workspace.

In light of these amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 97-117 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

TONY BRUMMEL, ET AL.

By 

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Boyle Fredrickson Newholm
Stein & Gratz, S.C.
250 E. Wisconsin Avenue, #1030
Milwaukee WI 53202
(414) 225-9755